

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on February 18, 2005.

Claims 17 and 20 are amended, no claims are canceled or are added; as a result, claims 17-25 are now pending in this application.

Affirmation of Election

Applicant previously elected to continue prosecution of claims 17-25. Applicant reserves the right to file a further divisional application on non elected and withdrawn claims 1-16 and 26-30 which will be cancelled upon allowance of claims 17-25.

§112 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 17-25 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant has amended independent claim 17 and 20 to more clearly claim the subject matter and respond to the rejection under 35 USC §112. The additions to the claims make clear that the rods are for warpage reduction under varying ambient conditions as defined in Applicants patent specification at paragraph [0045].

Reconsideration of the amended claims and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 17-25 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Mori et al. (U.S. 5,482,471 hereinafter "Mori").

The Mori patent relates to a socket for testing integrated circuit packages. It has a lower block 10 and an upper block 20 and a spring biased slide block 40 mounted to slidably reciprocate in a recess formed between the upper and lower blocks. The slide block 40 has a plurality of apertures 41 which open and close contacts 11 upon movement of the cover member 30 by the use of a contact part opening and closing element 50 converting movement of the

cover 30 into sliding action of the slide block 50. Mori does not address the issue of warpage reduction of socket connectors.

In the Office Action it is contended in support of the rejection of claim 17 that Mori shows "forming at least one groove 14 in a socket housing 10 contiguous to a surface mount region for an electrical device 40..." Applicant respectfully traverses the Office Action's characterization of Mori. The Office Action fails to state how what Mori consistently refers to as "slide block 40" can be construed to be "an electrical device 40" as the Office Action asserts.

The Office Action continues, stating "...inserting a rigid bar 50 into the groove 14 to thereby ensure that the surface mount region is flat and remains flat..." Again the Office Action fails to point out how it is that the recited structure in any way is shown by Mori to keep the surface mount region flat (the Office Action never explains what part of Mori is the "surface mount region"). Applicant's understanding of Mori is that grooves 14 receive lever arms 52 (and 51) of the "contact parts opening and closing mechanism 50."¹ Mori goes on to describe a mechanism that moves a slide block 40 slidably and horizontally as cover mechanism 30 is moved vertically. Mori says absolutely nothing that shows or suggests that closing mechanism 50 acts to ensure that the unspecified surface mount region is flat and remains flat in varying ambient conditions.

The Office Action fails to make out a *prima facie* case of anticipation since it has failed to show that Mori anticipates each and every element of the rejected claims arranged as called for in the claims.

Dependent claims 18 and 19 are not anticipated since they add additional features to claim 17 which, as shown above, is distinguishable from the cited Mori patent.

The Office Action also fails to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation by Mori as to independent claim 20, merely stating "Limitations of claims 20-25 are also satisfied as the above discussion." Since anticipation was not shown in the specific parsing of claim 17 relative to Mori, the Office Action also fails to show anticipation as to claim 20 and its dependent claims 21-25 which the Office Action did not even attempt to apply to Mori. The Office Action failed to meet the burden of showing how Mori anticipates each and every element of the claims.

Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

¹ Mori Col 6, lines 34-35

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney ((612) 373-6970) to facilitate any further prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

TIM A. RENFRO ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.

Attorneys for Intel Corporation

P.O. Box 2938

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402

(612) 373-6970

Date

July 18, 2005

By

Charles E. Steffey
Charles E. Steffey
Reg. No. 25,179

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 18th day of July, 2005.

Name

Amy Moriarty

Signature

[Signature]